



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/665,258	09/22/2003	Thomas Goering	11884-400301	7117
23838	7590	10/17/2008	EXAMINER	
KENYON & KENYON LLP 1500 K STREET N.W. SUITE 700 WASHINGTON, DC 20005			PITARO, RYAN F	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2174		
		MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE
		10/17/2008		PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/665,258	GOERING, THOMAS	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	RYAN F. PITARO	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 September 2008.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 15 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-14 and 16 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This action is in response to the Amendment filed 9/8/2008. In the Amendment Claims 1-14,16 were amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-8,16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ries et al ("Ries", US 2004/0217985) in view of Phillips ("Phillips", US 6,425,121) in further view of Rivera et al ("Rivera", US 2004/0003353) in view of Giljum et al ("Giljum", US 7,404,141).

4. As per independent claim 1, Ries teaches a computer system for customizing form elements in a form building application (page 81, paragraph [1858]), comprising:

a form builder component configured to receive an identification of a user of the form building application, the form building application providing a graphical user interface manipulating of a set of form elements under development ([0057]-[0058], Figure 2), and to enable access to a subset of the form elements according to authorization rules [0073] restrict access); and an access manager component configured to determine the authorization rules associated with the user's authorization to develop the set of form elements ([0073], advanced editing functions). Ries fails to particularly point out global attributes and a set of form elements separate from the form. However, Phillips teaches a system wherein the form elements include global attributes of the form including the layout of the form (Figure 4B) and the form building application is configured to display the set of form elements separate from the form (Column 8 lines 43-53). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the teaching of Phillips with the method of Ries. Motivation to do so would have been to provide a useful way to organize form development. Ries-Phillips fails to distinctly point out teaching the elements indicating access rights. However, Rivera teaches a system wherein the form elements indicate the authorization for the user to develop the form element [0047] and [0059], each object marked). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the teaching of Rivera with the system of Ries-Phillips. Motivation to do so would have been to ensure only selected users or groups of users may obtain access to

specific data. Ries- Phillips-Rivera fails to distinctly point out teaching an access manager that retrieves the authorization rules using user identification, and configured to enable access to the user. However, Giljum teaches an access manager that retrieves the authorization rules using user identification, and configured to enable access to the user (Column 8 lines 4-27). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the teaching of Giljum with the modified method of Ries. Motivation to do so would have been provide a simple and organized way of apportioning responsibility for web site creation and maintenance tasks to the most appropriate individuals.

Independent claim 5 is similar in scope to independent claim 1 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

5. As per claim 2, the modified Ries teaches the system of claim 1, wherein the identification of the user is based on login information (Ries, [0073] username password).

Claim 6 is similar in scope to claim 2 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

6. As per claim 3, the modified Ries teaches the system of claim 1, wherein the authorization rules are determined via a lookup table associating the user identification with the authorization rules for the user (Ries, [0060] login brain).

Claim 7 is similar in scope to claim 3 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

7. As per claim 4, the modified Ries teaches the system of claim 3, wherein the authorization rules include settings that identify the subset of the form elements, which are viewable and/or changeable (Ries, [0073] access to only certain hooks).

Claim 8 is similar in scope to claim 4 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

8. As per claim 16, the modified Menninger teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the form building application is configured to display only the set of form elements that the user is authorized to modify (Ries, [0059]-[0060])

9. Claims 9-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Menninger (“Menninger”, US # 2003/0048301) in view of Ries et al (“Ries”, US

2004/0217985) in view of Phillips ("Phillips", US 10665258) in view of Rivera et al ("Rivera", US 2004/0003353) in view of Giljum et al ("Giljum", US 7,404,141).

10. As per independent claim 9, Menninger teaches a computer-implemented method for customizing an electronic form (page 81, paragraph [1858]), comprising: responsive to a command by a user to change an element of the form (page 81, paragraph [1858]), rejecting the command unless the access rights associated with the user's identifier permit the user to change the form element (page 61, Table 21, *deny access to applications*). However Menninger does not teach expressly the method comprising: the permission list identifying access rights for a plurality of form elements that are under development contained in the form; and comparing an identifier associated with the user to those the access rights for the form element to be changed.

Ries teaches a method editing a webpage comprising: the permission list identifying access rights for a plurality of form elements under development contained in the form ([0060], login brain); and comparing an identifier associated with the user to those the access rights for the form element to be changed ([0072]-[0073], access rights). Menninger and Ries are analogous art because they are in the same field of endeavor, namely managing access rights within graphical user interfaces. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the functions as taught by Ries into Menninger's method for editing information in order to provide a more fine-grained access control. Ries fails to particularly point out global attributes and a set of form elements separate from the

form. However, Phillips teaches a system wherein the form elements include global attributes of the form including the layout of the form (Figure 4B) and the form building application is configured to display the set of form elements separate from the form (Column 8 lines 43-53). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the teaching of Phillips with the method of Menninger-Ries. Motivation to do so would have been to provide a useful way to organize from development. Ries-Phillips fails to distinctly point out teaching the elements indicating access rights. However, Rivera teaches a system wherein the form elements indicate the authorization for the user to develop the form element [0047] and [0059], each object marked). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the teaching of Rivera with the system of Ries-Phillips. Motivation to do so would have been to ensure only selected users or groups of users may obtain access to specific data. Menninger-Ries Phillips-Rivera fails to distinctly point out teaching an access manager that retrieves the authorization rules using user identification, and configured to enable access to the user. However, Giljum teaches an access manager that retrieves the authorization rules using user identification, and configured to enable access to the user (Column 8 lines 4-27). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the teaching of Giljum with the modified method of Menninger. Motivation to do so would have been provide a simple and organized way of apportioning responsibility for web site creation and maintenance tasks to the most appropriate individuals.

11. As per claim 10, the modified Menninger, teaches the method of claim 9, wherein the command by the user to change the form element includes selecting in a form building application a node representing the form element (Ries, [0072]).

12. As per claim 11, the modified Menninger, teaches the method of claim 9, wherein the access rights are defined for form elements representing a form's corporate identity (Menninger, page 29, paragraph [0624] – page 30 Table 3).

13. As per claim 12, the modified Menninger, teaches the method of claim 9, wherein the access rights are defined for form elements representing a form's interface to an application program (Menninger, page 61, Table 21, *deny access to applications*).

14. As per claim 13, the modified Menninger, teaches the method of claim 9, wherein the access rights are defined based on at least one of user id (Ries, [0076]), job title (Menninger, fig. 63), department code and position in the corporate hierarchy (Menninger, page 44, paragraphs [0991] – [0997]).

15. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Menninger ("Menninger", US # 2003/0048301) in view of Ries et al ("Ries", US 2004/0217985) in view of Phillips ("Phillips", US 10665258) in view of Rivera et al

(“Rivera”, US 2004/0003353) and Giljum et al (“Giljum”, US 7,404,141) in view of Bray et al (“Bray, 6,529,905).

16. As per claim 14, the modified Menninger fails to distinctly point out teaching giving access to all elements for each successive user only giving access to those elements which have not been edited. However, Bray teaches giving for each successive user of the electronic form authorization to electronic form elements that have not been edited (Column 4 lines 34-53). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the teaching with the modified method of Menninger. Motivation to do so would have been to keep organization and fairness based on some sort of priority.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-14,16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to RYAN F. PITARO whose telephone number is (571)272-4071. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am - 5:30pm Mondays through Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/R. F. P./
Art Unit 2174

/Stephen S. Hong/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 2178